



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_44048
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of Combinations of Extracts of Euphorbia abyssinica and Coleus species for Antifungal Effects
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You need to name and to describe the extract method. Not only to refer "using the method described by (8). 2. Name the standard mycological techniques. 3. Name of the pour-plate method. Ej: pour-plate method as described by Arnold, 1975 (9). 4. Same note for macrobroth dilution technique as described by _____ (5). 5. You need more to explain the results of antifungal susceptibility testing because you don't to refer more information. Who are the two plants? Names of plants. 6. You need to explain the FIC result. Its very complicate to return the materials for to known what is the FIC E and Flc C, and FIC Index, etc. You need to explain these results. 7. You need to put the number of figures in order. 5,6, 7 etc. Not 5,6 8. 8. Be careful with spaces in letters and numbers. Ej. 6 hours, Fig. 5,6,7) Not & and). 9. You need to put a number that to refer a % of inhibition of pathogenic. It is very confuse if you put >. Not is correct. 10. You need to explain more your figure because your figures have many interpretations, by these reason your result are very poor. You need to say more about the interaction of your species. 11. Refer in discussion "the mysteries" is not a word in science. You need to change these word or idea. 	<p>Tarh et al. [2015] They were subcultured, purified and their identity reaffirmed by slide culture, staining and biochemical tests. Tarh and Iroegbu, (2017b) Tarh and Iroegbu, (2017a) 5. Done. <i>E. abyssinica</i> (E) and <i>Coleus species</i> (C). 6. Done 7. done 8. checked 9. The author do not have a problem with the expression 10. Some more explanations have been done where necessary. 11. The word has been changed</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	